

EXHIBIT 30

US District Court - Delaware
Chapter 11 - W.R. Grace

FINAL - November 1, 2007
Jacob Jacoby, Ph.D.

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CHAPTER 11

IN RE:

W.R. GRACE & CO., et al.,
Debtors

Case No. 01-1139 (JFK)
Jointly Administered

DEPOSITION OF
Jacob Jacoby, Ph.D.
November 1, 2007
New York, New York
Lead: Elli Leibenstein, Esquire
Firm: Kirkland & Ellis

FINAL COPY

JANE ROSE REPORTING 1-800-825-3341

JANE ROSE REPORTING
1-800-825-3341 janerosereporting.com

US District Court - Delaware
Chapter 11 - W.R. Grace

FINAL - November 1, 2007
Jacob Jacoby, Ph.D.

Page 82

1 your full objection against the federal rules.

2 MR. ANSBRO: Dr. Jacoby, when I have
3 completed my objection you may answer the
4 question.

5 My objection is as to the form and
6 specifically the word "would." It is vague, it
7 is ambiguous, and it calls for speculation.

8 MR. LEIBENSTEIN: This is improper.
9 These are improper objections.

10 A. The answer to the question is --

11 MR. LEIBENSTEIN: And I will hold the
12 deposition open because of these improper
13 objections.

14 A. I don't know.

15 Q. Did Orrick ever ask you to make any
16 assumptions about whether lawyers would continue
17 to develop their cases because of other
18 defendants in the cases in which Grace was sued?

19 A. No.

20 Q. As far as you know, did the stay
21 prevent lawyers for the claimants from talking
22 to the plaintiffs' co-workers?

23 MR. ANSBRO: I'm sorry, may I hear the
24 question back?

25 (Question read)

US District Court - Delaware
Chapter 11 - W.R. Grace

FINAL - November 1, 2007
Jacob Jacoby, Ph.D.

Page 83

1 A. I don't know.

2 Q. Did the stay prevent lawyers from
3 talking to clients or family members?

4 A. I don't know.

5 Q. Did Orrick Herrington ask you to make
6 any assumptions about that?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Would you agree with me that if you
9 look at the assumptions that Orrick Herrington
10 asked you to make about exposure, those
11 assumptions do not relate to what the employee's
12 occupation was as opposed to whether they were
13 exposed specifically to Grace product?

14 A. My recollection is I was not asked to
15 consider occupation, and even had I been asked
16 to, I wouldn't have the requisite background to
17 make evaluations.

18 Q. Would you agree with me that you
19 weren't asked also as to whether there would be
20 additional discovery as to what the plaintiffs
21 did with respect to either installing or mixing
22 asbestos?

23 A. I am missing something. Maybe it is
24 too --

25 Q. I'll try it again.

US District Court - Delaware
Chapter 11 - W.R. Grace

FINAL - November 1, 2007
Jacob Jacoby, Ph.D.

Page 86

1 **whether any further discovery could have been**
2 **done by the plaintiffs' lawyers?**

3 A. I did make such assumptions. Oh, as
4 far as -- no, you are right. I am talking about
5 defendant could have.

6 **Q. That's right. Would you agree with me**
7 **you weren't asked to make any assumption about**
8 **whether there could have been any further**
9 **discovery by plaintiffs with respect to whether**
10 **the plaintiffs either mixed or installed**
11 **asbestos or did not?**

12 MR. ANSBRO: Objection to form.

13 A. That's correct. I don't recall being
14 asked any -- anything on that or told anything
15 on that.

16 **Q. Would you agree with me that with**
17 **respect to whether a claimant mixed or installed**
18 **asbestos, that's not something you would take**
19 **discovery from Grace about, is that correct?**

20 MR. ANSBRO: Objection to form. Go
21 ahead. Form and foundation, and to the extent
22 it calls for an opinion beyond this witness's
23 expertise.

24 Go ahead.

25 A. I would presume that Grace wouldn't

US District Court - Delaware
Chapter 11 - W.R. Grace

FINAL - November 1, 2007
Jacob Jacoby, Ph.D.

Page 87

1 know.

2 **Q. And you would need to talk to third**
3 **parties about that, isn't that correct?**

4 A. That I don't know. You might be able
5 to find out from third parties.

6 **Q. Now, you talked about -- well, strike**
7 **that.**

8 **Would you agree with me that the work**
9 **done by Princeton Research group -- I'm sorry,**
10 **what's the name?**

11 A. The Princeton Research Consulting
12 Center, PRCC.

13 **Q. Would you agree with me that the PRCC**
14 **determined that 96 percent of the claimants**
15 **provided medical information?**

16 A. I don't recall that from their report.

17 **Q. Do you have appendix C, table one?**

18 **MR. ANSBRO: C?**

19 A. I think -- yes, I do have -- let's
20 make sure it is C. But I do have -- yes, it is.

21 **Q. Do you see that for mesothelioma, 96**
22 **percent of the claimants provided medical**
23 **information in answer to part two?**

24 A. What I see is that they fully answered
25 part two.